

### Remarks

Claims 1-29 are pending.

The Examiner objected to Claim 16 for including an abbreviation, and rejected the same claim under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for including the term “Cross CAA Bundled Tiering.” As amended, Claim 16 fully complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner rejected Claim 1-2, 4-15 and 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the disclosed prior art (“Disclosed Prior Art”) at Applicant’s Specification, at page 1, line 15 to page 2, line 21, in view of *Expert System for Experts* (“Parsaye”). With respect to Claim 1, the Examiner states:

**Regarding Claims 1-2, Disclosed Prior Art discloses, a method for pricing financial transactions (products), said method comprising:**

- Creating a plurality of price tables (fee arrangements – see p. 2, lines 1-7);
- A plurality of product rules (product designation “Fee arrangements can take many shapes, e.g., by product... see p. 2, lines 1-7) each applicable to one or more of said financial transactions (products), wherein each of said product rules (product designation) is linked to one of said price tables (fee arrangements). (see p.2, lines 1-21) and
- For each one of said financial transactions (products). (see p.2, lines 1-21);
- Identifying an applicable one of said product rules...
- Pricing said transaction...

- Wherein said price table (fee arrangement) comprises a billing (calculation of fees) methods (see p. 2, lines 1-21)

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach in a data processing system, a method for pricing financial transactions, said method comprising:

- Creating, in a database system of the data processing system, a plurality of price tables; and
- Creating, in a database system, a plurality of product rules each applicable to one or more of said financial transactions, wherein each of said product rules is linked to one of said price tables.

Disclosed Prior Art does not teach that the utilization of price tables (fee arrangements) is automated. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have automated the method, since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity that accomplishes the same result involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Venner*, 120 USPQ 192.

Storage of information in a database and the use of a rule-based system/method for retrieval and filtering of said information is old and well-known in the art of computer system designs and expert system design, as evidenced by Parsaye (see pp. 35-60 and 195-211). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art by incorporating a database storage capacity and a rule-based system/method for retrieval, as disclosed by Parsaye, to allow for the use of an expert system to automate the retrieval and application of data, such as pricing, efficiently and quickly.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Claim 1 recites:

1. (Previously amended) In a data processing system, a method for pricing financial transactions, said method comprising:

creating, in a database system of the data processing system, a plurality of price tables;

creating, in the database system, a plurality of product rules each applicable to one or more of said financial transactions, wherein each of said product rules is linked to one of said price tables; and

for each one of said financial transactions:

identifying an applicable one of said product rules for said transaction; and

pricing said transaction according to the price table linked to said identified applicable product rule.

As clearly recited in Claim 1, and explained in Applicant's specification, at page 4, lines 1-31, and at page 30, lines 24-37, "product rules" and "price tables" are interacting entities of a database system. In this instance, Claim 1 further recites that the product rules and the price tables are linked. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the disclosure in Applicant's Specification (at page 1, line 15 to page 2, line 21), which the Examiner characterized as "Disclosed Prior Art," neither discloses nor suggests product rules or price tables. In fact, that portion of Applicant's Specification does not disclose the operations of a database system, but relates only generally the fee arrangements and the competitive environment associated with financial services:

Furthermore, fee arrangements change in value and structure in response to competitive situations. Fee arrangements can take many shapes, e.g., by product; by time of submission; by specified execution time; by window of time between submission and execution; by transaction value; by pre-assigned payment slots; and/or by some combination of these. In addition, customers are mobile and shop for the best deals. The methods of payment, timings of payment, cash management practices and credit requirements change. Also, competitors pricing strategies change. In response to these changes, FSCs need the ability to calculate pricing accordingly.

Therefore, FSCs not only need to be able to accurately

measure the internal economics of the delivery of each product, the margin, the value of the customer relationship overall, and how those measures are changing. The FSCs also need the flexibility to perform relationship pricing by product or across products, taking special arrangements into consideration. In the same time, the FSCs need an infrastructure to keep up with the ever-changing market demands.

As interacting product rules and price tables are not described in the disclosure above, the Examiner's statement that Applicant's Claim 1 is mechanical or automation of manual activities is not supported. Further, a general reference to "rule-based system/method for retrieval and filtering of ... information" does not disclose or suggest the specific recitation of product rule entities and price tables in Claim 1. Since the portion of Applicant's disclosure that the Examiner relied does not disclose the price tables and product rules database entities recited in Claim 1, the combined teachings of Applicant's disclosure and Parsaye simply do not meet Claim 1's limitations. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2, 4-15 and 19-22 are each allowable over the combined teachings of Applicant's disclosure at page 1, line 15 to page 2, line 21, and Parsaye. Reconsideration and allowance 1-2, 4-15 and 19-22 are therefore requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 3, 17-18 and 23-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Disclosed Prior Art and Parsaye, as the Examiner construed under Claim 1, and in further view of Hendler (Hendler, James A., *Expert Systems: The User Interface*, Albex Publishing Corporation, Norwood, N.J. 1988, pp. 31, 46-47, 113 and 133). With respect to Claim 3, the Examiner states:

Hendler discloses a method wherein each of said product rules (rules) comprise:

- A name of said product rule (rule) ...

- A status of said product rule...
- Display only information. (Rule accesses knowledge base and retrieved information is “selectively displayed as desired by the knowledge base author or eventual users by using the DISPLAY command...

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Disclosed Prior Art and Parsaye by incorporating a linkage between the product rule and stored data, as disclosed by parsaye, and naming the product rule, providing a status of the product rule and assigning display only information, as disclosed by Hendler, to incorporate and utilize standard conventions and procedures commonly utilized for rule-based expert systems.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejection. As discussed above, Applicant’s disclosed information that the Examiner termed “Disclosed Prior Art” neither discloses nor suggests the “product rules” and “price tables” entities recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. Further, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Hendler also neither discloses nor suggests “product rules” recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. Hendler discloses merely general concepts of a rule-based system. Hendler does not disclose or suggest pricing a financial transaction, as recited in Claim 1. As Claims 3, 17 and 18 each depend from Claim 1, these claims are therefore allowable over the combined teachings of “Disclosed Prior Art,” Parsaye, and Hendler. Similarly, Claims 23-29, each also reciting “price tables” and “product rules” entities of a database system, are therefore also allowable over the combined teachings of “Disclosed Prior Art,” Parsaye, and Hendler. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 3, 17-18 and 23-29 are therefore requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that all pending claims (i.e., Claims 1-29) are allowable. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the above, the

Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant at 408-392-9250.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on February 27, 2006.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

2/27/2006

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Edward C. Kwok  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 33,938

Law Offices of  
MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP  
1762 Technology Drive, Suite 226  
San Jose, CA 95110  
Tel: (408) 392-9250  
Fax: (408) 392-9262